



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/663,069	09/15/2000	Anandakumar Varatharajah	A-69227/MAK/LM	3198
30636	7590	03/11/2005	EXAMINER	
FAY KAPLUN & MARCIN, LLP 150 BROADWAY, SUITE 702 NEW YORK, NY 10038			GARG, YOGESH C	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3625		

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*(Signature)* **Office Action Summary**

Application No.	09/663,069	Applicant(s)	VARATHARAJAH, ANANDAKUMAR
Examiner	Yogesh C Garg	Art Unit	3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 November 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Amendment***

1.1. The applicant's amendment received on November 15, 2004 is acknowledged and entered. The applicant has amended claims 5, 9, 11, 12, and 13. Currently, claims 1-2, 5-19 are pending for examination. The applicant has also filed a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.131.

1.2. The Declaration filed on 11/15/2004 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the "Tech Trends" published article and "ReceiptCity Teams" published article, submitted as references in the previous office action for following reasons:

(a) The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the above-cited references. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897).

(b) The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the above cited reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice.

See MPEP 715.07 Facts and Documentary Evidence [R-2] - 700 Examination of Applications 715.07 Facts and Documentary Evidence [R-2] :

“ > I. < GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

The essential thing to be shown under 37 CFR 1.131 is priority of invention and this may be done by any satisfactory evidence of the fact. FACTS, not conclusions, must be alleged. Evidence in the form of exhibits may accompany the affidavit or declaration. Each exhibit relied upon should be specifically referred to in the affidavit or declaration, in terms of what it is relied upon to show. For example, the allegations of fact might be supported by submitting as evidence one or more of the following.....”.

Also, the 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration must contain an allegation that the acts relied upon to establish the date prior to the reference or activity were carried out in this country or in a NAFTA country or WTO member country. See 35 U.S.C. 104.

***Response to Arguments***

2.1 Applicant's arguments (see pages 6 and 8) filed on 11/15/2004 with respect to rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-8, and 16-18 under USC 103 (a) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as the declaration submitted under CFR 1.1131 is defective (see paragraph 1.2 above.).

2.2. Applicant's arguments (see page 6 ) filed on 11/15/2004 with respect to rejection of claims 5, and 13 under USC 112, second paragraph have been fully considered and are persuasive in view of the amendments made to them. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

2.3. Applicant's arguments (see page 6) filed on 11/15/2004 with respect to rejection of claims 11-12 under USC 112, second paragraph have been fully considered but they

Art Unit: 3625

are not persuasive because the amendments made to them do not render them definite or enable them to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention. In the currently amended claim 11 it is unclear what " appending a reproduction of the first selected goods to a reproduction of the second selected goods " comprises. The plain meaning of this statement is that first selected goods are remade and attached to the second selected goods. The invention is not directed to remaking or reproducing of goods or attaching one set of goods to another. The currently amended claim 12 recites " retrieving an electronic record of the first and second orders". There is insufficient antecedent basis for " electronic record". Claim 9 does not recite any reference to electronic records related to the first and second orders.

2.4. Applicant's arguments (page 7 of the Amendment) with respect to claims 9-10 have been considered but are not persuasive. The applicant argues that his claimed invention can complete all of the purchases, including products chosen from other merchant's websites, through the last website that is viewed but Kraemer patent does not and therefore does not disclose or suggest paying for the first and second goods through the second website with one transaction from a consumer perspective. The examiner respectfully disagrees as Kraemer does show purchasing products from different merchants and then closing his purchase transaction with one transaction at the website where he wants to close his purchasing sequence ( see at least col.7, lines 35-43).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-2, 5-8, 14-15, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

**3.1. Claimed Invention(s) does not fall within the Technological Art.**

As an initial matter, the United States Constitution under Art. I, §8, cl. 8 gave Congress the power to "[p]romote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries". In carrying out this power, Congress authorized under 35 U.S.C. §101 a grant of a patent to "[w]hoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition or matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof." Therefore, a fundamental premise is that a patent is a statutorily created vehicle for Congress to confer an exclusive right to the inventors for "inventions" that promote the progress of "science and the useful arts". The phrase "technological arts" has been created and used by the courts to offer another view of the term "useful arts". See *In re Musgrave*, 167 USPQ (BNA) 280 (CCPA 1970). Hence, the first test of whether an invention is eligible for a patent is to determine if the invention is within the "technological arts".

Further, despite the express language of §101, several judicially created exceptions have been established to exclude certain subject matter as being patentable subject matter covered by §101. These exceptions include "laws of nature", "natural phenomena", and "abstract ideas". See *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450, U.S. 175, 185, 209 USPQ (BNA) 1, 7 (1981). However, courts have found that even if an invention incorporates abstract ideas, such as

Art Unit: 3625

mathematical algorithms, the invention may nevertheless be statutory subject matter if the invention as a whole produces a "useful, concrete and tangible result." See *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group, Inc.* 149 F.3d 1368, 1973, 47 USPQ2d (BNA) 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

This "two prong" test was evident when the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA) decided an appeal from the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI). See *In re Toma*, 197 USPQ (BNA) 852 (CCPA 1978). In *Toma*, the court held that the recited mathematical algorithm did not render the claim as a whole non-statutory using the Freeman-Walter-Abele test as applied to *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 175 USPQ (BNA) 673 (1972). Additionally, the court decided separately on the issue of the "technological arts". The court developed a "technological arts" analysis:

The "technological" or "useful" arts inquiry must focus on whether the claimed subject matter...is statutory, not on whether the product of the claimed subject matter...is statutory, not on whether the prior art which the claimed subject matter purports to replace...is statutory, and not on whether the claimed subject matter is presently perceived to be an improvement over the prior art, e.g., whether it "enhances" the operation of a machine. *In re Toma* at 857.

In *Toma*, the claimed invention was a computer program for translating a source human language (e.g., Russian) into a target human language (e.g., English). The court found that the claimed computer implemented process was within the "technological art" because the claimed invention was an operation being performed by a computer within a computer.

The decision in *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group, Inc.* never addressed this prong of the test. In *State Street Bank & Trust Co.*, the court found that the "mathematical exception" using the Freeman-Walter-Abele test has little, if any, application to determining the presence of statutory subject matter but rather, statutory subject matter should be based on whether the operation produces a "useful, concrete and tangible result". See *State*

Street Bank & Trust Co. at 1374. Furthermore, the court found that there was no "business method exception" since the court decisions that purported to create such exceptions were based on novelty or lack of enablement issues and not on statutory grounds. Therefore, the court held that "[w]hether the patent's claims are too broad to be patentable is not to be judged under §101, but rather under §§102, 103 and 112." See State Street Bank & Trust Co. at 1377. Both of these analysis goes towards whether the claimed invention is non-statutory because of the presence of an abstract idea. Indeed, State Street abolished the Freeman-Walter-Abele test used in Toma. However, **State Street never addressed the second part of the analysis, i.e., the "technological arts" test established in Toma because the invention in State Street (i.e., a computerized system for determining the year-end income, expense, and capital gain or loss for the portfolio) was already determined to be within the technological arts under the Toma test.** This dichotomy has been recently acknowledged by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI) in affirming a §101 rejection finding the claimed invention to be non-statutory. See *Ex parte Bowman*, 61 USPQ2d (BNA) 1669 (BdPatApp&Int 2001).

In the present application, Claims 1-2, 5-8, 14-15 do not recite the use of technological arts in implementing the method steps. The steps of selecting line items, reviewing a list, placing an order, commenting on a list, participating in transactions could be performed manually by people without using a technological art. Therefore, the claims are directed towards non-statutory subject matter. To overcome this rejection the Examiner recommends that Applicant amend the claims to better clarify which of the steps are being performed within the technological arts, such as incorporating/integrating a computer/software/hardware computer network or electronic network functionally with manipulative steps recited in the claims.

3.2. In claims 16-18, the elements , e-merchants, data farms, and shopping service do not recite any structural details related to hardware and are therefore considered mere “Data Structures” not claimed as embodied in a computer –readable medium. See MPEP 2106 (iv)(B)(i)(a) :

“ Functional Descriptive Material: “Data Structures” Representing Descriptive Material *Per Se* or Computer Programs Representing Computer Listings *Per Se*.

Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material *per se* and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure *per se* held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure’s functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure’s functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. .... Since a computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer, the computer program itself is not a process and Office personnel should treat a claim for a computer program, without the computer-readable medium needed to realize the computer program’s functionality, as nonstatutory functional descriptive material. When a computer program is claimed in a process where the computer is executing the computer program’s instructions, Office personnel should treat the claim as a process claim. See paragraph IV.B.2(b), below. When a computer program is recited in conjunction with a physical structure, such as a computer memory, Office personnel should treat the claim as a product claim. See paragraph IV.B.2(a), below.”

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4.1. Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to

Art Unit: 3625.

one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 11 recites, "appending a reproduction of the first selected goods to a reproduction of the second selected goods to create an electronic record of the selected goods " and this subject matter is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The plain meaning of this statement is that first selected goods are remade/reproduced and attached to the second selected goods. The invention is not directed to remaking or reproducing of goods or attaching one set of goods to another. The invention is directed to adding products from e-commerce sites to a review list ( see specification page 3, lines 14-18) or to allow consumers to select one or more line items from different transaction records to form one review list (see specification page 11, lines 14-16).

Claim 13 recites the limitation, " viewing an advertisement during the step of paying " and this subject matter is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification merely discloses providing advertisements for display on a consumer's computer (see specification, page 14, lines 2-4) and does not disclose that these advertisements are displayed during payment.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 3625

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted step is: creating an electronic record of the transactions of the first and second orders (see specification page 5, lines 23-26).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2, 5, 7, 8-12, and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kraemer (US Patent 6,490,602)

Regarding claims 1-2, 5, 7, 8, 14-15, Kraemer discloses a method for manipulating receipt data, the method comprising:

participating in a first transaction at a first merchant and participating in a second transaction at a second merchant, thereby generating first and second electronic

receipts , selecting a first line item from a first electronic receipt and selecting a second line item from a first electronic receipt/second electronic receipt, thereby forming a list including both the first and second line items; authorizing a group of people to review the list, reviewing the list, the reviewing performed by one of the group of people and placing a order for the first line item by one of a consumer and a shopping service (see col.5, line 25-col.6, line 63: Note: The electronic receipt corresponds to any stored transaction record [see applicant's specification page 5, lines 23-26] in data form which can be communicated via a network. Kraemer teaches allowing gift-recipients to participate with a plurality of web-pages belonging to different merchants, selecting first and second line items from the web-pages [web-pages selected by the gift-recipient correspond to the claimed electronic receipts as they are generated as a result of selection of products from different merchant sites, and the gift-recipient is capable of selecting one or more items from a web-page of one vendor and more items from another web-page of another vendor ] and then forming a list of these products including both first and second line [ col.6, lines 7-11,..."*Adding the product to a list of products in the account associated with the user. Sufficient information about the retailer and product are gathered and stored in an account created for the gift-recipient to enable the product to be purchased at a later date*"] and the group of purchasers, who want to buy gifts for the gift-recipient are authorized to review this list of products and place an order for the first line item by one of a consumer and a shopping service [ the purchaser corresponds to the consumer and the functionality server 100 corresponds to a shopping service as claimed]).

Regarding claims 9-12, Kraemer teaches a method for purchasing goods, including services, from multiple merchants, the method comprising:

selecting first and second goods for purchase on respective first and second websites (it is already covered in claims 1-2, 5, 7-8 and 14-15 above); paying for the first and second goods through the second website with one transaction from a consumer perspective, wherein the step of paying comprises automatically placing first and second orders for the first and second goods with the respective first and second websites (see at least col.7, lines 35-43, "*The method of the present invention may be used to devise a multi-retailer shopping cart, whereby the user can accumulate multiple products from independent retailers within a single virtual shopping cart. The user may select a "Purchase all products" within the toolbox to submit their credit card and contact information to all the retailers, for all the products within their shopping cart, all at once. Purchasing multiple products from multiple retailers all at once significantly increases convenience for the user.*" Note: Since the user is allowed to purchase from a plurality of websites and if he is purchasing from two different websites then he would inherently close his purchase transaction at the second website and by selecting the button, "Purchase all products" he checks out at the second website which inherently includes the payment as well for the products and the orders are placed on the first and second websites belonging to first and second vendors. ), appending a reproduction of the first selected goods to a reproduction of the second selected goods to create an electronic record of the selected goods and retrieving an electronic record of the first and second orders (see at least col.5, line 25-col.6, line 63, which discloses, as analyzed above for claims 1-2, 5, 7-8 and 14-15 that items selected by the gift-recipient from a web-page for one vendor are added to the items listed from

Art Unit: 3625

another web-page of another vendor to form a gift registry list and this registry list is retrieved by the purchaser to view the items. Note: Electronic record corresponds to the list for products, that is gift-registry formed by the gift-recipient).

Regarding claims 16-17, their limitations are already covered in claims 1-2, 5, 7, 8, 14-15, and are therefore analyzed and rejected on the same basis. The first and second e-merchants correspond to web-pages of different vendors, a data farm correspond to the memory of the functionality server which stores the web-pages [the electronic receipts], and the functionality server 100 corresponds to a shopping service which perform the claimed limitations as already analyzed in claims 1-2, 5, 7, 8, 14-15 above.

Regarding claims 18-19, their limitations are already covered in claims 1-2, 5, 7, 8, 14-15, and are therefore analyzed and rejected on the same basis.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3625

7.1. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Kraemer and in view of Official Notice.

Regarding claim 6, Kraemer discloses reviewing as already analyzed in claim 2 above. Kraemer further discloses that reviewing comprises viewing (see at least col.6, lines 41-44, “*.....the gift-giver may be presented with a series of screens, the total of which displays the gift-recipient 's list of registered gifts...*” ) but does not disclose commenting on the list. The examiner takes Official Notice of the notoriously well-known fact that gift-givers after viewing the gift-registry do comment by expressing their opinion about the items they saw and their cost and availability for selection with their family members or common friends. In view of the Official Notice, it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art to have modified Kraemer to modify to incorporate the notoriously well-known concept of comments by gift-givers after viewing the gift-registry because it helps the other family members and friends to make informed and better decisions in selecting the gifts for the gift-registrant.

7.2. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Kraemer and in view of the article posted on Internet, “ End-to-End Enterprise Solution: Extending the Reach of Retail Stores Through Point-of-Sale Web Technology” (December 1999 on website <http://java.sun.com/features/1999/12/atpos..html>).

Regarding claim 13, Kraemer further teaches viewing an advertisement (see at least col.3, line 53-col.4, line 7, “*..... Toolbar 150 provides enhanced functionality, such as services "Purchase this product" or "Register this product." Toolbar 150 may also provide other general functions such as "Home" and "Help". Toolbar 150 may also include a graphical presentation such as an*

*advertisement. .... Toolbar 150 may also include sponsored presentations such as advertising banners.* ") but does not disclose that this advertisement is displayed while paying.

However, in the field of same endeavor, "End-to-End Enterprise Solution" discloses this feature ( see page 1, " ....customers select their preferred payment method.... participate in surveys and be treated to targeted color display and banner ads...all the time it takes to process the customer's payment transaction... "). In view of "End-to-End Enterprise Solution", it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have modified Kraemer to incorporate the feature of displaying advertisement during the step of paying because the advertisements fills up the payment processing time, which is utilized to display targeted advertisements based upon the customer's profile and which is expected to increase the revenues and profits of the manufacturers of items for which the advertisements are displayed.

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

(i) US Pub.No: 2005/0027611 A1 to Wharton discloses an Electronic Commerce system using a global shopping basket allowing users to enter one portal via communication network and shop for multiple merchants and then place orders on each vendor but completing the checkout in a single transaction and generating electronic receipts of the transaction records (see at least paragraphs 0001-0035).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yogesh C Garg whose telephone number is 703-306-0252. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wynn Coggins can be reached on 703-308-1344. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Yogesh C Garg  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3625

YCG  
March 3, 03